

RECEIVED

Denis Beller

OCT 10 2001

Amargosa Valley Public Hearing

0054

552363

3 DR. BELLER: Denis Beller.

4 MODERATOR BROWN: I'm sorry. Denis Beller.

5 DR. BELLER: Good afternoon, ladies and

6 gentlemen. I'm Dr. Denis Beller from UNLV. I'm here

7 today to present the statement of Professor Per

8 Peterson, a long-time Nevada resident who resides in

9 California. Dr. Peterson requested that I read from

10 the comments that he submitted on September 5th after

11 carefully reviewing the PSSE and the Science and

12 Engineering Report.

13 Dr. Peterson grew up in Las Vegas and he was

14 educated in Nevada, from elementary school here through

15 his Mechanical Engineer degree at the University of

16 Nevada-Reno. He earned his Doctorate from the

17 University of California at Berkeley, one of the most

18 prestigious and environmentally and socially conscious

19 universities in the nation. Dr. Peterson's expertise

20 is in the areas of heat and mass transport, the primary

21 processes that govern the performance of geologic

22 repositories. He was a Presidential Young Investigator

23 of the National Science Foundation there from 1990 to

24 1995, and he currently serves as a Professor and the

552363

25 Chair of in their Department of Nuclear Engineering.

0055

1 Dr. Peterson's review of the Preliminary Site

2 Suitability Evaluation, which focused primarily on the

3 engineered barrier system, can be summarized as

4 follows:

5 The current engineered barrier system applies

6 the well-established safety design principles that have

7 been widely used for design licensing of aircraft,

8 skyscrapers, and nuclear reactors. Multiple,

9 independent and diverse barriers have been used in the

10 Yucca Mountain engineered-barrier system design so that

11 the failure of any individual barrier will not degrade

12 total performance.

13 I add that this same design philosophy let

14 the World Trade Center remain standing long enough for

15 about 20,000 people to escape on September 11th.

16 Dr. Peterson continues: The multiple-barrier

17 approach of the Yucca Mountain Project includes a

18 highly corrosion-resistant canister material that is

19 predicted to have small to negligible corrosion over

20 tens of thousands of years. The design also uses a

21 titanium drip shield -- another highly

552363

22 corrosion-resistant material -- to prevent any contact
23 of water with the canister. Thus even when analyses
24 assume an unanticipated, non-mechanistic failure of a
25 barriers, the system still achieves the same overall
0056

1 safe performance.

2 Thus one of Dr. Peterson's primary
3 conclusions is: The current repository design is
4 likely to be successful in meeting the applicable
5 radiation protection standards established by the EPA
6 and the NRC and that the engineered-barrier system can
7 meet the required licensing criteria by large margins.

8 Dr. Peterson also provided a comparison
9 between the Yucca Mountain site and other geologic
10 media being considered by various international
11 repository-research programs, so that such a comparison
12 is included as a part of the public record for the
13 decision-making process.

14 He said, with a large and diverse array of
15 geologic settings, the United States had the unique
16 opportunity to identify a potential repository site
17 that is located above the water level in unsaturated
18 hard-rock media. Other international repository

552363

19 programs have adopted safety design principles similar
20 to those of the Yucca Mountain design, but they have
21 focused on saturated media which require that the waste
22 be embedded and sealed into small bore-holes.

23 Conversely, the placement of waste in open tunnels in
24 Yucca Mountain provides a unique flexibility because it
25 will be easy to move and rearrange waste canisters, or
0057

1 to retrieve and use this material, or to select
2 alternative disposal methods in the future.

3 These features that are unique to unsaturated
4 geologic media, as at Yucca Mountain, should be given
5 special consideration.

6 In addition, because the tunnels at Yucca
7 Mountain are drilled into hard, stable rock, decisions
8 to close the repository can be delayed indefinitely,
9 which will actually minimize the burden on future
10 generations to manage this waste.

11 If the Yucca Mountain Suitability Decision is
12 negative, the United States must then site a repository
13 and alternative geologic media, different from the
14 unsaturated tuff found at Yucca Mountain. This would
15 be a negative legacy for future generations of

552363

16 Americans.

17 He concludes his letter with the following
18 statement: "The Yucca Mountain Preliminary Site
19 Suitability Decision report gives strong evidence that,
20 with the current design of engineered barriers, Yucca
21 Mountain can be licensed to meet the radiation
22 standards established by the EPA and NRC. The site is
23 unique upon possible geologic media for the flexibility
24 it provides for future generations to make their own
25 decisions about the management of these nuclear wastes,
0058

1 while minimizing the burdens our generation will place
2 on these future generations. I support a positive site
3 suitability decision."

4 Signed, Professor Per F. Peterson, Professor
5 and Chair, Department of Nuclear Engineering,
6 University of California, Berkeley.